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Welcome

• Purpose of Training
• How the session will be organized
• All information is provided in the PART Guidance at [www.omb.gov/part](http://www.omb.gov/part)
Overview

• Executive Order
• 2008 PART Schedule
• 2008 Quality Improvement Review
• Suggestions on Completing a PART
• Where We are Today
• PARTWeb & ExpectMore.gov Changes
• PART Guidance Changes
  – Program Reassessments
  – Past Guidance Changes
  – Efficiency Measure Guidance Enhancements
• Rigorous Evaluation Refresher
• Questions & Answers
Executive Order 13450
Improving Government Program Performance
November 13, 2007

• Establishes Performance Improvement Council (PIC) with Performance Improvement Officers (PIOs)
  – supervise the performance management activities of the agency
  – Strategic plans, annual performance plans, rigorous program evaluation, means for measurement toward achievement of goals

• List of PIOs is available at omb.gov/part
2008 Quality Improvement Review

• December 10 – February 22 – OMB’s Office of Performance and Personnel Management (OPPM) will initiate an initial review and assessment of PART goals

• By January 30 – Each agency establishes a select panel for the review and assessment of their agency’s performance and efficiency goals. The panel is to be chaired by the agency’s Performance Improvement Officer and should include personnel that coordinate Annual Performance Plans (APPs), PARTs, and Performance and Accountability Reports (PARs) and potentially agency research and evaluation and other offices.

• February 25 through March 21 – OMB’s Resources Management Offices (RMOs) engage with agencies to finalize a set of actions to improve the quality of performance goals with planned completion dates.

• March 24 through June 30 – Agencies work with RMOs to revise or create new measures for inclusion in APPs, PARTs, and PARs

• Ultimate Outcome: reach agreement on a set of actions to improve the quality of measures and targets used by the agency and the program in three areas covered by the PART:
  – Long-term Measures: Program outcomes that fulfill the program’s purpose;
  – Annual Measures: Implementation of plans and efforts to achieve long-term and strategic goals; and
  – Efficiency Measures: Efforts to provide the most benefits (outcomes and outputs) for the taxpayer dollar spent.
2008 PART Schedule

- Agencies Complete PART Drafts by **March 31st**.
- Consistency Check and Review of Performance Measures – **April 29th to May 5th**.
- Appeals due by **May 27th**.
- Complete PART Summaries & Improvement Plans for ExpectMore.gov by **July 9th**.
- Data Entry Locked on **July 25th**.
- PARTs published on ExpectMore.gov in **mid-August**.
Suggestions for a Successful PART Season

- Share drafts, communicate frequently to plan and coordinate.
- Use clear, direct language in explanations and evidence.
- Stick to the deadlines.
- Don’t take the PART personally.
- Rely on evidence, not anecdotes.
- Don’t flood OMB with mounds of “evidence”. Point out exactly where the evidence is any document.
Where We Are Today
Distribution of Cumulative Ratings 2002 - 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Results Not Demonstrated</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Moderately Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where We’ve Come From

PART Ratings when First Assessed by Ratings Category 2002-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Results Not Demonstrated</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Moderately Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARTWeb Analytical Reports

PART Measures (text only) by Agency and Type Custom Report (2007 Fall Update) Version 1 11/16/2007 11:32 AM
PART Measures (text only) by Type Custom Report (2007 Fall Update) Version 1 11/16/2007 1:24 PM

2007PART Ratings And Funding Version 1 8/14/2007 10:24 AM
Agency Ratings Custom Report Version 3 5/2/2007 3:53 PM
Agency Ratings for All Agencies Report Version 1 5/2/2007 3:52 PM
PART Measures (text only) by Agency and Type Custom Report (2007 Fall Update) Version 1 11/16/2007 11:31 AM
PART Measures (text only) by Type Custom Report (2007 Fall Update) Version 1 11/16/2007 1:17 PM
### PARTWeb Performance Measures

#### Entry Screen

#### Prison Construction 2005 Update Assessment

**Add Performance Measure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long- term</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Construction Cost per bed for Medium Security Facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$74,512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$76,079</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$75,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$75,303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$74,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$66,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$63,376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$68,343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$92,097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$84,031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Long- term | Efficiency | Percent of Modernization and Repair Projects completed on time. |
| Year | Target | Actual State |
| 2004 | Baseline | 41% |
| 2005 | 65% | 90% |
| 2006 | 78% | |
| 2007 | 85% | |
| 2008 | 95% | |
| 2009 | 95% | |
| 2010 | 95% | |
| 2011 | 95% | |
| 2012 | 95% | |
| 2013 | 95% | |

| Annual | Outcome | Critical Systems Equipment Replacements in Accordance with Industry Standards. |
| Year | Target | Actual State |
| 2004 | Baseline | 17% |
| 2005 | 20% | 27% |
| 2006 | 30% | |
| 2007 | 40% | |
| 2008 | 50% | |
| 2009 | 70% | |
1. Review prior year summaries to ensure accuracy of data and update data, if necessary

2. Revise Improvement Plan to match ongoing activities
Resources on PART

• OMB’s Performance Portal
  – www.omb.gov/part
    • Information on process and schedule
    • Guidance for completing PART
    • PARTWeb link, user’s manual
    • Supporting materials

• MAX Community Performance Portal
  – https://max.omb.gov/community/display/Performance/Home
• www.ExpectMore.gov
• www.results.gov
Welcome to the Performance Community!

For the latest information on PART, visit the public Performance Portal at http://www.omb.gov/part

The Performance Community was created to give Federal program managers continuous and timely access to information that will assist them in improving the performance of government programs.

Program managers can use this Community to share their agency-specific information and ideas, and collaborate with other Federal managers and the OMB. Additionally, this web page can also be used by the Performance Improvement Council to share and collaborate on the President’s Performance Improvement Initiatives.

Quick Links
- Federal Program Managers
- Performance Improvement Council Collaborations
- Data Cells and Exercises
- Documents and Guidance
- Human Capital
- Shared Information
- Media on Performance

Recently Updated
- PIO Agency Contact Information
- Media on Performance
- PARTWeb Import Export Documentation - Detailed.doc
- Home
- PIC 2006 Schedule.doc
- PIC 2008 Schedule.doc
- Performance Community-Highlights
- PIO Roles, Responsibilities final 1-22-2008.doc
- PIO Roles, Responsibilities and Resources 1-22-2008
- PIO Roles, Responsibilities final 1-22-2008.doc

Performance Community-Highlights
- PIO Roles and Responsibilities
- Performance Improvement Council contact information has been posted. PIO Council Contact Information
- Official Memo Implementing Executive Order 13450: Improving Government Program Performance Implementing EO 13450
- November 13, 2007 President Signs Executive Order Implementing Improving Government Program Performance
- PIC 2008 Schedule
2008 Guidance Changes

• No major changes
Past Guidance Changes

• Questions 1.4 (design flaws) and 1.5 (targeting resources) distinction. Clarification:
  – The former addresses alternative mechanisms to achieve a program’s goals, while the latter asks whether resources under the current program design are oriented toward efficiently achievement of the program’s purpose.
  – One design flaw should not be the reason for No on both Question 1.4 and 1.5.
Past Guidance Changes

• Yes for Questions 2.1, 2.3, and 3.4 require performance measures to be listed in the PART.

• Yes to Question 3.3 on timely obligation of funds requires accurate reporting of program awards (e.g., in the Federal Assistance Awards Data System, the Federal Procurement Data System—Next Generation, etc.)
Past Guidance Changes

• Capital Assets Programs: Includes criteria for analysis of alternatives (Question 2.CA1).

• Regulatory-based program-specific questions streamlined:
  – Question 3.RG3 on review of regulations for consistency was deleted.
Efficiency Measures
(pp.9-11; Questions 3.4 and 4.3)

• Reflect economical and effective acquisition, utilization, and management of resources to achieve program outcomes or produce program outputs.

• Can also reflect improved design, creation, and delivery of goods and services.
Efficiency Measures (pp.9-11)

• **Outcome efficiency**
  – Preferred type of performance measure that captures improvement in efficiency with respect to a program’s outcomes.

• **Output efficiency**
  – Performance measure that captures improvement in efficiency with respect to a program’s outputs.

• **Input productivity**
  – Ratio of an outcome or output to an input.
Efficiency Measures

• Must have baselines and targets (pp. 41-43)

• Question 3.4 is linked to Question 4.3

• Question 4.3 explanation should include specific information about the program’s annual savings and how they were achieved (p. 58)
In comparisons among time periods, output efficiency measures are only valid when the outputs intended to be produced within each time period are comparable.

- To assure validity, the PART requires assessment of the comparability of the kinds of outputs produced during measurement periods.
Program Evaluations (Question 2.6 and 4.3)

• Question 2.6:
  – Yes response requires demonstration that evaluation methods used provide the most rigorous evidence of a program’s effectiveness that is appropriate and feasible.
  – Lays out criteria for quality, scope, independence and frequency of evaluation.
Program Evaluations

• **Scope** - Examine the underlying cause and effect relationship between the program and achievement of performance targets.

• **Independence** - Performed by non-biased parties with no conflict of interest should conduct the evaluations. (TBD by agency and OMB staff.)

• **Quality**
  – **Applicability** – All programs expected to undergo some type of evaluation.
  – **Impact** – Prefer effectiveness evaluations consider a program’s impact (outcome, e.g., whether the Federal intervention makes a difference).
  – **Rigor** – Provide the most rigorous evidence that is appropriate and feasible for that program.
Quality Program Evaluation

• Can a program demonstrate impact?
  – If Yes - randomized controlled trials are generally the highest quality, unbiased evaluation to demonstrate actual impact, but only when it is appropriate and feasible to conduct such studies.
  – If No - a variety of quasi-experimental methods (e.g., comparison group studies) and non-experimental methods may help shed light on how or why a program is effective.
  – Bottom line - Evaluations must be appropriate to the type of program.
Does It Ever End?

• Steps after PARTs are completed
  – Draft summaries for ExpectMore.gov
  – Complete Improvement Plans
    • All programs must have regardless of PART rating
    • Focus on the findings in the PART assessment
    • Implement plans and report on progress
  – ExpectMore.gov release mid-August
Questions and Answers

James Hurban – 202-395-6833, jhurban@omb.eop.gov
Daren Wong, 202-395-3797, Daren_K_Wong@omb.eop.gov